

REMARKS

Claims 15 and 16 are amended, no claims are canceled, and no claims are added; as a result, claims 1-20 are now pending in this application.

§102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 15 and 17-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Yoshimura (U.S. 5,629,642).

Elements recited in independent claim 15 are missing from Yoshimura

Claim 15 as amended now recites, "producing a substantially noise free current signal." [Emphasis Added] In contrast, Yoshimura concerns a constant voltage generator, wherein at column 6, lines 24-25 Yoshimura states, "FIG. 8 is a circuit diagram of the second constant voltage generator 19 in the slewing rate detector 8 shown in FIG. 2." [Emphasis Added] Further, at column 6, lines 35-41 Yoshimura states,

This circuit is similar to that of the first generator 18, and a difference between the voltages V1 and V2 can be provided at a high precision irrespective of temperature and power supply voltage. It is a feature that a capacitor is not used in contrast to the first generator 18, and this makes it hard for the second generator 19 to be affected by change in power supply voltage. In the first generator 18 shown in FIG. 2, a voltage drop at the resistor 13 assures a voltage difference between V1 and V2. {Emphasis Added]

Thus, Yoshimura concerns using a constant voltage generator to maintain a difference in voltages and the affect of change in power supply voltage on the that difference in voltages. A voltage generator circuit is not a circuit for producing a current signal, and persons of ordinary skill in the art would not recognize a constant voltage generator as providing a substantially noise free current signal. Thus, Yoshimura fails to teach producing a substantially noise free current signal as recited in claim 15 by a disclosure of a constant voltage generator.

Further, claim 15 as amended now recites, "processing the substantially noise free current signal and the one or two power supply signals to detect a noise signal in the one or two power supply signals." In contrast, Yoshimura at column 3, lines 24-34 recites,

The second generator 19 generates a second constant voltage V2 which is somewhat smaller than the first voltage V1 when the first voltage V1 is stable, and supplies it to another input of the comparator 20. The first voltage V1 has AC coupling through the capacitor 17 to the power supply line, while it is affected by noises in the power supply line. Then, the comparator 20 compares the first voltage V1 with the second constant voltage V2 insulated electrically from the power supply line in order to detect noises. The output of the comparator 20 is sent to the signal holding circuit 26. [Emphasis Added]

Thus, Yoshimura is concerned with comparing a first voltage V1 with a second constant voltage V2, and so fails to teach comparing a substantially noise free current signal with power supply signals as recite in amended claim 15.

For at least the reasons stated above, Applicant submits that the Office Action fails to state a *prima facie* case of anticipation with respect to claim 15. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and reconsideration and allowance of claim 15.

Elements recited in dependent claims 17-20 are missing from Yoshimura

Claims 17-20 are dependent on claim 15, and therefore include all the elements recited in claim 15. For example, as amended claim 15 recites, "producing a substantially noise free current signal," and further, "processing the substantially noise free current signal and the one or two power supply signals to detect a noise signal in the one or two power supply signals" Yoshimura fails to teach these elements, and so fails to teach each of the elements of claims 17-20.

In addition other elements recited in dependent claims 17-20 are not taught by Yoshimura. For example, claim 17 recites, "receiving two voltage signals having different polarities." Fig. 2 of Yoshimura shows only one voltage supply, namely Vcc. Applicant submits that ground is not a voltage supply having a different polarity, and so Fig. 2 of Yoshimura, as relied on in the Office Action on page 2, fails to teach "receiving two voltage signals having different polarities" as recited in claim 17.

In another example, claim 18 recites, "comparing the one or two power supply signals to the substantially noise free current signal." As noted above, Yoshimura at column 3, lines 24-34 concerns comparing two voltage signals, but fails to teach "comparing one or two power supply signals to a substantially noise free current signal," as recited in claim 18.

For at least the reasons stated above, Applicant submits that the Office Action fails to state a *prima facie* case of anticipation with respect to claims 17-20. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and reconsideration and allowance of claims 17-20.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant acknowledges the allowance of claims 1-14.

Claim 16 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but was indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 16 is so rewritten. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the next official communication indicate that claim 16 is allowed.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney ((612) 373-6904) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

CHAIYUTH CHANSUNGSAN ET AL.

By their Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
Attorneys for Intel Corporation
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
(612) 373-6904

Date June 20, 2005

By Daniel J. Kluth
Daniel J. Kluth
Reg. No. 32,146

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 20 day of June, 2005.

Daniel J. Kluth
Name

Daniel J. Kluth
Signature